

CONFIDENTIAL

Chief, []/FI

JAN 20 1954

Deputy Director of Training

External Research on PW Personnel

1. Reference is made to your memorandum dated 30 December 1953, addressed to the Deputy Director of Training, subject as above. The following comments are submitted concerning attachments forwarded with your memorandum. The Assessment and Evaluation Staff, Office of Training, has in the past conducted similar research in connection with courses offered by OTR and would have a particularly active interest in the project identified as []. In general it is felt that this project has been well planned and this office would be greatly interested in receiving final reports resulting from the research effort of the Human Resources Research Office.

2. Certain technical aspects of the project have been commented upon by Chief, Research Branch, Assessment and Evaluation Staff. His comments are quoted verbatim below.

a. It is not clear whether the validities which are reported on the Strong, MMPI, etc., are those of established scales or scales developed from empirical keys.

b. What field criteria are they working on?

c. Readministering the revised tests to the original sample in Phase II of this study will spuriously raise the back-validity of these tests and will therefore emphasize their shrinkage on subsequent cross-validation. It can contribute nothing new to the study, and therefore seems quite unnecessary.

d. It is difficult to understand how [] r's were obtained with the Strong and the MMPI, both of which are profile scored; unless they are reporting selected scales within the instruments. If the report is for the highest correlations of scales within the instrument, then a basic tenet of the "F" test has been overlooked.

CONFIDENTIAL

25 YEAR RE-REVIEW

CONFIDENTIAL

a. The obvious problem of using nomination in training or performance in training as a substitute criterion for field performance appears here. It is dangerous to assume relationships between "approximated" and "true" criteria.

3. With respect to the project identified as the following specific comments may be of use from a technical point of view.

25X1

a. This type of investigation is more likely to reveal differences in interpreting the curriculum titles than differences in their importance to the job. In this respect the "critical" incident" study of Part II, if undertaken first, might provide a more meaningful basis for the questionnaire proposed for initial use. Unless a criterion group or a set of group standards is decided upon in section 2 (4), this phase of the study is likely to provide unrelated uninterpretable information.

b. It is suggested that a comparison of field performances be made between groups of trained and untrained individuals; and that the factors of new and old curricula be considered. In fact it is probable that a priori determinations would be as valid as any results from the present proposals would be.

/s/

25X1

OTR/PRS/LBS:dkm (15 January 1954)

Distribution:

- 1 & 2 cc - addressee
- 1 cc - DD/TR ✓
- 1 cc - D/TR (info) - To C/a + E 1/28/54
- 1 cc - PRS files

CONFIDENTIAL